

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 343

LI 002 133

AUTHOR Stewart, Rolland C.
 TITLE The Undergraduate Library Collection.
 INSTITUTION California Univ., San Diego. University Library.
 SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology
 (DHEW/OE), Washington, D. C.
 PUB DATE 69
 NOTE 7p.; Paper prepared for the Institute on
 Acquisitions Procedures in Academic Libraries...,
 Aug 25-Sep 5, 1969
 EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 PC-\$0.45
 DESCRIPTORS *Books, *College Libraries, Institutes (Training
 Programs), *Library Collections, *Library Material
 Selection, *University Libraries

ABSTRACT

The development of undergraduate library collections is shown under two aspects: (1) the formation of the basic collection of the Undergraduate Library of the University of Michigan, and (2) the problems, practical and theoretical, encountered in the day-to-day effort to maintain the collection. The budget is the sire of all selection criteria. Objectives and the means to achieve them must be commensurate. Even in the effort to assemble a basic collection, the amount of investment needed for subsequent support must be anticipated. The policies adopted at the outset of the selection project concern: (1) extent and range of collection, (2) service patterns for handling of required and recommended reading, (3) budget arrangements for maintaining the collection and (4) basic selection responsibilities for future development. Sources from which preliminary selections may be drawn include: (1) the Lamont Library Catalog, (2) faculty reading lists, (3) in-print publisher's catalogs, announcements, etc., (4) current acquisitions of the University of Michigan Library, (5) University of Michigan Library Shelflist, and (6) special bibliographies, guides, lists, and journal reviews. Correlated with the amount of money committed, the selection proceeds in three stages: (1) the indispensable, (2) the necessary, and (3) the highly desirable. (NH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED0 43343

Institute on
ACQUISITIONS PROCEDURES IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

sponsored by
The University Library
University of California, San Diego*

August 25 - September 5, 1969

THE UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARY COLLECTION

by

Rolland C. Stewart
Associate Director, University Library
University of Michigan

*Conducted under a grant
from the U.S. Office of
Education, Title II-B,
Higher Education Act of
1965, P.L. 89-329, as
amended.

LT 002133

The Undergraduate Library Collection

I. Development of undergraduate library collections to be shown under two aspects: (1) the formation of the basic collection of the Undergraduate Library of the University of Michigan; (2) the problems, practical and theoretical, encountered in the day-to-day effort to maintain the collection.

The theory of undergraduate libraries: for all their growing popularity there is scant evidence that librarians have articulated the assumptions on which undergraduate libraries are established. Some obvious assumptions: that book collections are readily divisible into graduate and undergraduate compartments; that the needs of graduate and undergraduate students differ to such an extent that separate libraries for each are justified; that the best answer to cascading enrollments in a separate home for undergraduates.

II. Defining the clientele to be served: the total undergraduate population irrespective of collegiate affiliation within the university? Undergraduates enrolled in Nursing, Music, Public Administration, Architecture, Engineering? Or undergraduates enrolled in what might be called the "general education" college, which at the University of Michigan goes under the name of the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts? The only practical definition to be concerned with relates to courses and not at all to students. Further questions follow: shall the collection satisfy all courses to which only undergraduates

are admitted or shall it include all courses for which undergraduates may enroll? The curricular structure of American universities is such that a high percentage of undergraduate students are actually enrolled in courses that are also given for graduate credit. This is strictly true with respect to upper-level undergraduate courses. Michigan chose to handle in its separate undergraduate library virtually all courses which undergraduates are permitted to take, the principal exceptions made being courses offered in such professional schools as Engineering, Architecture, etc. This policy required, therefore, that we build a four-year undergraduate library, which is far different from a freshman-sophomore library complex designed to cover the required and recommended reading for the lower reaches of the undergraduate curriculum.

III. Assuming that we have groped our way through the mystique of defining purposes and have got hold of an ideological tool with which we can create an undergraduate collection, we face the question of money, prospects for more money, and still more money. Paradoxically speaking, the budget is the sire of all selection criteria we might devise. Objectives and the means to achieve them must be commensurate. Even in a present effort to assemble a basic collection one must anticipate the amount of investment needed for subsequent support. Michigan had in excess of \$200,000 for the basic collection. There is, or ought to be, a rule of thumb specifying the amount required annually to maintain a collection of a given size.

Aside from budget, there are other questions calling for quantitative answers: How many titles is the basic collection to consist of? How many duplicates or added copies to be purchased and on what student-copy ratio? How many current periodicals are to be provided? Of the

periodicals subscribed to, what length of backfiles is desirable? The size of the reference collection? Enough to satisfy the needs commonly referred to as "normal" of undergraduates? Enough to decrease significantly the dependence of the undergraduate on the central reference collection?

How is the separate undergraduate library to be related to the divisional library system? At Michigan there are twenty-five or more special libraries, among them Fine Arts, Architecture, Public Administration, Music, Education, Mathematics, Physics-Astronomy. To what extent should, to what extent can, an undergraduate collection duplicate divisional collections?

IV. The policies adopted at the outset of the selection project provide a partial answer to the foregoing questions. These policies concern:

- a. Extent and range of collection
- b. Service patterns for handling of required and recommended reading; relationship of the undergraduate library to other divisions, student-copy ratios, etc.
- c. Budget arrangements for maintaining the collection
- d. Basic selection responsibilities for future development

V. The selection medium: the compilation of a desiderata list of approximately 100,000 titles, the list to be an aggregate of preliminary selections drawn from many sources such as:

- a. The Lamont Library catalog
- b. Faculty reading lists
- c. In-print publisher's catalog^{es}, announcements, etc.

- d. Current acquisitions of the University of Michigan Library
as shown by temporary catalog slips
- e. University of Michigan Library Shelflist
- f. Special bibliographies, guides, lists, journal reviews

VI. The buying list: A selection of selections carried on in three stages or three successive readings, correlated with amount of money committed as selection proceeds.

Stage 1-----identification of the indispensable

Stage 2-----identification of the necessary

Stage 3-----identification of the highly desirable

VII. Current problems

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARY

Annual Statistics for the First through Tenth Years of Operation

| | <u>Attendance</u> | <u>Circulation for Home Use</u> | <u>Book Use in Library</u> | <u>Total Book Use</u> |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Jan. 16, 1958 - Jan. 15, 1959 | 1,420,865 | 134,719 | 280,037 | 414,756 |
| Jan. 16, 1959 - Jan. 15, 1960 | 1,569,286 | 162,269 | 454,265 | 616,534 |
| Jan. 16, 1960 - Jan. 15, 1961 | 1,516,297 | 166,881 | 474,133 | 641,014 |
| Jan. 16, 1961 - Jan. 15, 1962 | 1,573,883 | 189,478 | 513,980 | 703,458 |
| Jan. 16, 1962 - Jan. 15, 1963 | 1,781,656 | 209,091 | 563,290 | 772,381 |
| Jan. 16, 1963 - Jan. 15, 1964 | 1,825,059 | 230,759 | 704,126 | 934,885 |
| Jan. 16, 1964 - Jan. 15, 1965 | 1,904,669 | 250,171 | 721,073 | 971,214 |
| Jan. 16, 1965 - Jan. 15, 1966 | 1,994,439 | 262,502 | 741,335 | 1,003,837 |
| Jan. 16, 1966 - Jan. 15, 1967 | 2,073,397 | 276,943 | 796,576 | 1,073,519 |
| Jan. 16, 1967 - Jan. 15, 1968 | 2,006,339 | 275,161 | 673,566 | 948,727 |
| TOTALS | | | | |
| Jan. 16, 1958 - Jan. 15, 1968 | 17,670,890 | 2,157,974 | 5,922,381 | 8,080,355 |

UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARY

COMPARATIVE STATISTICS

First and Tenth Full Annual Report Year

| | <u>1958-59</u> | <u>1967-68</u> | <u>Percentage of Ten year Increase</u> | |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------------------|---|
| Attendance | 1,457,441 | 1,987,069 | + 36.3 | % |
| Circulation for Home Use | 141,624 | 286,917 | + 102 | % |
| Book Use in Library | 339,888 | 659,112 | + 93.9 | % |
| Total Book Use | 481,512 | 946,029 | + 96.4 | % |
| Collection Growth | | | | |
| Titles | 40,000 | 69,000* | + 72 | % |
| Volumes | 68,590 | 140,000* | + 104 | % |
| Seating (Total) | 1,938 | 2,315 | + 19 | % |
| Average Weekly Hours of Opening** | 100 | 121 | + 21 | % |
| Reserve books | 14,470 | 44,869 | + 210 | % |
| Reserve Lists | 539 | 834 | + 54 | % |
| Reserve Periodicals | 732 | 10,377 | +1317 | % |
| Reserve Office Processing Staff | 4.85 FTE | 6.95 FTE | + 43 | % |
| Total Undergraduate Library Staff (FTE) | 38.4 | 54.8 | + 42 | % |
| LSA Undergraduate Enrollment*** | 7,357 | 11,839 | + 60 | % |
| LSA Total Enrollment*** | 12,818 | 16,048 | + 25 | % |

* Estimated

** Irregularities existed in both years

*** An average representative gross enrollment per Fall and Spring and/or Winter Term from Statistical Services